

Claims 1-17

A stated object of Janning is to provide “a transmission system for digital information that permits such digital information to be transmitted from a substantively electrically shielded environment.” Col. 3, lines 40-45. Janning communicates billing information to a transceiver in the form of a radio signal:

Once the dispenser transceiver 22 is positioned sufficiently close to the receptacle transceiver 50 to permit reception of the interrogation signal and the receptacle transceiver 50 acknowledges reception of the interrogation signal during a polling cycle of the dispenser transceiver 22, the receptacle transceiver 50 transmits billing information (e.g., a credit card or debit card account number, expiration date, creditor identification, or any other information stored by the issuer of the charge or debit account) to the dispenser transceiver 22 in the form of a radio signal 55. . . . By using low frequency magnetic coupling to convey information instead of high frequency electromagnetic coupling, the receptacle transceiver 50 can be located within substantially electrically shielded environments physically associated with the receptacle 51 for the product, such as automobile trunks or automobile hoods, without substantially affecting transmission or reception.

Col. 9, lines 31-58. The Janning dispenser transceiver thus communicates actual credit card or debit card information to a receptacle transceiver. Janning does not teach or suggest “accessing customer data based on the identifier,” particularly with an identifier that is “associated with a token presented by a customer,” as recited, in part, in claim 1.

Janning states that systems that encode a transponder “with a secondary account number that identifies, but does not actually represent, an actual credit card or debit account number” (col. 2, lines 63-65) are deficient because “such an approach limits or complicates universal acceptance of the system by vendors other than the issuer of the transponder due to the need to make available to other vendors a database cross referencing the actual and secondary account numbers.” Col. 2, line 66- Col. 3, line 3. Janning thus teaches away from the claimed invention.

As the Office Action acknowledges, Janning also does not teach or suggest “identifying in the customer data a preferred payment method for the customer,” as also recited in claim 1.